DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 362 CG 030 516

AUTHOR Mack, Delores E.; Tucker, Traci W.; Cha, Susan Oh
TITLE Inter-Ethnic Relations on Campus: The Color of Hatred.
PUB DATE 2000-08-00
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association (108th, Washington, DC, August 4-8, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Asian American Students; Black Students; Educational Environment; *Ethnic Bias; Higher Education; Hispanic American Students; *Racial Bias; *Racial Discrimination; Social Attitudes; Student Attitudes; Undergraduate Students; White Students
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; European Americans; *Hate; Latinos

ABSTRACT

Undergraduate students (N=1,271) from a consortium of small private colleges in California, a mid-size university in California, a large public university in Texas, and a large commuter university in Illinois were surveyed on their experience with ethnic and racial hatred. Based upon self-report, 54.3% of the sample were European American, 18% were Asian American, 8% were Latino, and 5.4% were African American. Also, 9.4% were multi-ethnic and 4.2% were other. The results indicated that while students from all ethnic groups were victims of hate incidents, they occurred more frequently for African Americans and Latinos. While it is clear that hate incidents and discrimination create a tense and hostile social climate on campus, it has yet to be determined how it affects academic functioning of ethnic minority students. Data indicates therapists should carefully assess a student's perception of hate incidents, racism, and discrimination on campus. Counselors have a responsibility to address hate incidents proactively. Research is needed on the ways to reduce hate crimes and improve inter-ethnic interactions. (Contains 2 tables and 14 references.) (JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 448 362

INTER-ETHNIC RELATIONS ON CAMPUS: THE COLOR OF HATRED

Delores E. Mack*
The Monsour Counseling Center
The Claremont Colleges
Claremont, California

Traci W. Tucker
Private Practice
Los Angeles, California

Susan Oh Cha**
Christian Counseling Center
San Jose, California

D. MACK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the 108th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., August 5, 2000.
Delores E. Mack, The Monsour Counseling Center 735 N. Dartmouth Avenue, Claremont, California 91711, Tel (909) 621-8202, Fax (909) 621-8482, e-mail deloresm@cuc.claremont.edu
****Special thanks to Randi Archuleta and Gary DeGroot who participated in the initial stages of this research project.***

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG 030519

INTER-ETHNIC RELATIONS ON CAMPUS: THE COLOR OF HATRED

Ethnic or racial hatred is becoming an important topic in American society. In 1998, Intelligence Report indicated, "474 hate groups blanket America." This special issue of the journal reported that not only had the number of hate groups in the United States increased by 20% from 1996 to 1997, but that hate sites were proliferating on the internet. Most research on ethnic group interaction and/or hatred has examined the ways in which one or more ethnic groups interacted with or were viewed by the dominant White majority. However, within the last two decades there have been dramatic changes in the demographic make-up of the U.S. population with some estimates indicating that by the year 2010 non-whites will comprise the majority of the population (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1991). This increase in America's ethnic population has created a rapid change in the ethnic make-up of our schools. The increasing diversity of our schools has been accompanied by an increase in group conflict (Ehrlich, 1995). Soriano, Soriano, and Jimenez (1994) found that hate crimes had occurred in one-third of Los Angeles' junior and middle schools and that 32% of a national sample of high school students reported incidents of racially motivated violence in their schools.

Ehrlich (1995) reported that there had been a sharp increase in the number of colleges and universities reporting ethnoviolence from 42 in 1987 to 113 in 1989. He noted that ethnoviolence was now common on campuses (71% of the schools surveyed in 1992-93 reported such incidents), was traumatic, and affected others (co-victimization) not directly touched by the violence. Levine and Cureton (1998) also reported an increase in tensions on college campuses. They found that 24% of the college deans surveyed had

seen rises in racial hate incidents, with 31% also reporting increases in gender incidents. In addition, 41% of the deans indicated that there was more tension regarding issues of diversity while 34% of those surveyed reported a greater sense of victimization among students. Dalton (1991) also reported that there is an increase in bias-related incidents on campuses. He hypothesizes that these incidents are due to increased competition and stress in higher education, a lack of knowledge and personal experiences with culturally diverse individuals, and a societal shift away from concerns about civil rights and social justice to emphasis on individual rights and consumerism. Downey & Stage (1999) noted that bias-motivated incidents tend to be grossly underreported because students either don't think that these incidents are serious or don't believe that the administration will take effective action.

Although much of the data suggest that campus ethnoviolence is perpetrated by white males, other evidence indicates that ethnoviolence also occurs between various ethnic minority groups. Evidence from community sources indicates that an increasing number of gang killings, prison riots, and middle and high school brawls can be traced to ethnic conflict between Latinos and Blacks (Rodriguez, 1994). The conflicts between Koreans and African Americans in several cities have been well publicized. Less well known is the conflict between Latino and Asian gangs in Southern California.

Consequently, it is important for psychologists and other social scientists to examine the ways in which members of our rapidly increasing ethnic minority population interact with each other as well as with White America. Examination of inter-ethnic relations involves a level of complexity that many previous research studies have not addressed with their tendency to focus on one or two ethnic groups. This study will focus

on several different ethnic groups with respect to both the victimization and the perpetration of incidents of hatred. It should be noted that this study will not focus on hate crimes, the criminal offenses that can be legally prosecuted. Our focus is on hate incidents. Hate incidents, like hate crimes, target individuals because of their ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or race. However, most hate crimes tend to involve excessive physical force, while hate incidents usually involve hateful speech (verbal or written) that negatively impacts the targeted individual, but does not necessarily cross the line into behavior that can be legally prosecuted. Thus, hate incidents pose a dilemma for university officials because of the conflict between the rights of the individual to free speech and the harmful way that such speech may impact not only the targeted individual, but also the entire campus community.

METHOD

Participants

The participants included 1271 undergraduate students from four different sources. CC, a consortium of five small private residential colleges in California, with a total population of approximately 4,600 students; PC, a mid-size university in California with an undergraduate population of 2,850 students; TU, a large public university in Texas with an undergraduate population of 20,000 students; and CU, a large commuter university in Illinois with 11,000 undergraduates. Based upon self-report, 54.3% of the sample were European American, 18% Asian American, 8.0% Latino, and 5.4% African American. In addition, there was a relatively large sample of multi-ethnic students (9.4%) and a smaller group classified as other (4.2%). Because of the difficulty in interpreting the "other" category, data from this classification will not be discussed.

Instrument

Data was collected utilizing a survey divided into five sections. The first four sections of the survey will not be discussed in this report. The fifth section of the survey asked students about their experiences with ethnic or racial hate incidents. Students were first asked whether they had experienced any type of hate incident on campus. They were then asked eight questions about specific types of incidents (e.g., name calling, insults, physical threats or attacks). In addition, students were asked how much they were affected by the incidents, how often these incidents occurred, and which groups they felt were responsible for the incidents.

Procedure

All students received information sheets and consent forms with the surveys. For practical reasons, the data were collected differently at each school. At CC, all students were mailed a survey packet. At PC, the surveys were distributed and collected by resident assistants in the dormitories. A small sample of surveys (200) was sent to a cultural enrichment center in order to obtain larger numbers of students from ethnic minority groups. At TU, because of the large undergraduate population, 800 students were randomly sampled by mail, while 200 students were randomly selected from lists of ethnic minority students. All survey materials were distributed by mail. At CU, 800 surveys were randomly distributed by mail, while 200 surveys were distributed to the ethnic centers and student groups in order to obtain larger samples of ethnic minority students.

RESULTS

Originally, in planning this study, we did not anticipate that such a significant number of students would be categorized as having multi-ethnic origins. Although we recognized that this group was quite varied and included different types of race/ethnic mixing, we decided to include this group of students in our analyses. Two-factorial analyses for interactions between ethnicity and school were utilized. If the interactions were not significant, then one-way ANOVA by either Ethnicity or School were utilized (with Tukey's HSD for post-hoc analyses). Tukey's HSD were performed only if the one-way ANOVA was significant. To control for alpha inflation, $p < .001$ is considered statistically significant, while $p < .005$ is considered directional. Data from the school analysis will not be discussed in this report.

Hate Incidents, Occurrences

One thousand one hundred and thirteen students responded to the question about experiencing a hate crime on campus (European Americans=608, Asian Americans=199, Mixed=106, Latinos=87, African Americans=62, and Other=51). With respect to the occurrence of hate incidents, there were no significant interactions, i.e. different ethnic groups did not experience different occurrences of hate incidents at the different schools. Approximately 25% of the sample reported that they had experienced a hate incident on their campus. The most prevalent type of hate incident was being insulted (Table 1). Students also reported that approximately 6-10 of these incidents occurred each year on their campuses.

Ethnicity. Data indicated that there were ethnic differences in the extent of victimization, F (5, 1107)=10.4. Asian and European Americans were less likely to report that they had experienced any type of hate incident when compared to African Americans and Latinos. Thus, 45% of the African American and 48% of the Latino students reported experiencing a hate incident as compared to 25% of the Asian American and 20% of the European American students. With respect to specific types of incidents, two of the eight types of incidents were significantly different by ethnicity, namely being insulted, F (5, 572)= 5.92 and being intimidated F (5, 564)= 4.09 (Table I). Tukey's post-hoc analyses indicated that Asian and European Americans were less likely to experience insults than African Americans and Latinos. Moreover, Latinos were more likely than Asian Americans, European Americans and Multi-Ethnic students to feel that others tried to intimidate them. There were also significant differences by ethnicity as to how seriously students were affected by their experiences of hate incidents, F (5, 512)=5.01. Tukey's post-hoc analyses indicated that European Americans were significantly less affected by their experiences of hate incidents than African Americans, Latinos, and Multi-Ethnic students.

Hate Incidents, Perceived Perpetrators

Four hundred and ninety-four students made a total of 633 comments about the perceived perpetrators of hate incidents (Table 2). The three identifiable groups most frequently held responsible for hate incidents were European Americans (34.4%), African Americans (15%), and males (6.5%). However, it should be noted that there were a significant number of anybody/everybody (30.2%) or don't know (11.1%) responses. Unfortunately, a relatively large number of comments made in response to this question

were derogatory in nature (16.6%). Derogatory comments included responses like "ignorant people," "the stupid ones," "stuck up snobs," "uneducated people," and "losers." There were no interactions between school and ethnicity with respect to whom was held responsible for perpetrating hate incidents.

Ethnicity. The comments that were significantly different across ethnicity were blaming Whites F (4,489)=8.05, blaming Blacks F (4,489)=5.38, and blaming every/anybody F (4,489)=3.46. Tukey's post-hoc analyses indicated that European Americans were more likely than African-Americans or Multi-Ethnic students to say that African Americans were responsible for hate incidents and more likely than African Americans to say that every/anybody was responsible. European Americans were also less likely than African or Asian Americans to say that European Americans were responsible for perpetrating hate incidents.

DISCUSSION

This study indicates that while students from all ethnic groups were victims of hate incidents, these incidents occurred more frequently for African Americans and Latinos. Our findings are consistent with data from McCormack (1998) that indicate that African Americans and Latinos felt more discriminated against than Asian Americans; and with other findings that indicate that the campus environment is perceived as less supportive and welcoming for ethnic minority groups, especially African Americans (Ancis, et al. 2000; Mack, et. al., 1997). It is noteworthy that not only do European Americans experience fewer hate incidents, but they are less negatively impacted by their experiences of hate. European Americans may have been less negatively affected by hate incidents because they were pursuing their careers in predominantly white institutions and had a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

basic sense of support and comfort which many ethnic minority students lack when attending predominantly white educational institutions.

While it is clear that hate incidents and discrimination create a tense, hostile, and separatist social climate on campuses, there has been little investigation on the impact that this hostile environment has on the academic functioning of ethnic minority students. One study (Watson and Kuh, 1996), however, suggests that the stress of discrimination and hate incidents negatively impact academic functioning. In their study of African Americans at predominantly white and predominantly black colleges, they found that African Americans at the predominantly black colleges experienced a higher level of educational gains when compared to African American students at predominantly white colleges. Moreover, a significant aspect of these gains was due to the relationships with faculty, administration and students at the predominantly black institutions.

These findings have implications for individual counseling with students. The data from this study and others indicate that therapists should carefully assess a student's perception of hate incidents, racism and discrimination on campus and in the surrounding communities. Furthermore, it is necessary for therapists to assess how these factors affect the student academically as well as emotionally. Students who perceive racism and discrimination should be provided with the tools necessary to address these issues and reduce the impact of these negative factors on their academic, social, and emotional adjustment.

In addition, as others (Ancis et. al., 2000; McCormack, 1998; and Salz & Trubowitz, 1997) have suggested, it is not enough to simply address these issues in individual counseling. Counselors and other mental health workers on college campuses

have a responsibility to address hate incidents and other forms of racism from a proactive, environmental perspective. This perspective requires that individuals work to create programs that will promote healthy inter-ethnic relations and ameliorate the impact of hate incidents and discrimination. Experience has indicated that if such programs are to have any impact, they must have support at the highest administrative level, be long-term, and mandatory. As we approach the 21st century, it is also quite clear that extensive research on the effectiveness of such programs is necessary. In the past, colleges and universities experimented with freshmen groups, courses, mentoring, teach-ins, workshops, sensitivity groups, peer group training, and other formats in an effort to improve inter-ethnic relationships. However, very few programs have been thoroughly researched and there is little information to indicate which programs are effective and under what conditions. This study highlights the need for such research to be conducted so that the lives of all students on campus can be improved by a reduction in hate incidents and an improvement in positive inter-ethnic interaction.

REFERENCES

Ancis, R., Sedlacek, W.E., & Mohr, J.J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. Journal of Counseling and Development, 78 (2), 180-185.

Craig, K.M. (1991). Teaching students about hate and changing awareness. Teaching of Psychology, 26 (1), 44-45.

Dalton, J.C. (1991). Racial and ethnic backlash in college peer culture. New Directions for Student Services, (56), 3-12.

D'Andrea, M. & Daniels, J. (1991). Exploring the different levels of multicultural training in counselor education. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70 (1), 78-85.

Downey, J.P. & Stage, F.K. (1999). Hate crimes and violence on college and university campuses. Journal of College Student Development, 40 (1), 3-9.

Erlich, H. (1995). Issues in diversity: Prejudice and ethnoviolence on campus Review, 6 (2). New Rochelle, NY: Higher Education Extension Service.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J.S. (1998). When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Mack, D.E., Tucker, T.W., Archuleta, R., DeGroot, G., Hernandez, A.A., & Cha, S.O. (1997). Inter-ethnic relations on campus: Can't we all get along? Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25 (4), 256-268.

McCormack, A.S. (1988). Revisiting discrimination on campus: 1988, 1992, and 1996. College Student Journal, 378-393.

Rodriguez, R. (1994). Black/Latino relations: An unnecessary conflict. Black Issues in Higher Education, 11 (16), 40-42.

Salz, A. & Trubowitz, J. (1997). It was all of us working together: resolving racial and ethnic tension on college campuses. The Educational Forum, 62, 82-90.

Soriano, M., Soriano, F. I., & Jimenez, E. (1994). School violence among culturally diverse populations: Sociocultural and institutional considerations. School Psychology Review, 23, 216-235.

Southern Poverty Law Center. (Winter, 1998). Intelligence Report.

Watson, L.W. & Kuh, G.D. (1996). The influence of dominant race environments on student involvement, perceptions, and educational gains: a look at historically black and predominantly white liberal arts institutions. Journal of College Student Development, 37 (4), 415 – 424.

Table 1: Hate Crimes by Ethnicity

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Differences Among Hate Crime Items by Ethnicity [a]

Hate Crime Items	All Students		Asian American		African American		Latino		European American		Multi-Ethnic		Significant Differences[c]
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Called Name	0.73	1.29	0.41	0.93	0.73	1.13	1.19	1.43	0.77	1.38	0.44	1.00	
2. Insulted	0.95	1.45	0.68	1.16	1.63	1.64	1.53	1.64	0.79	1.40	1.01	1.47	EA < AA, L; A < AA, L
3. Harassed	0.41	1.01	0.24	0.64	0.38	0.96	0.74	1.28	0.42	1.06	0.45	1.09	
4. Intimidated	0.79	0.13	0.59	1.09	0.90	1.52	1.45	1.62	0.70	1.27	0.66	1.19	L > A, EA, ME
5. Received insulting phone calls or letters	0.13	0.53	0.10	0.43	0.20	0.69	0.30	0.87	0.09	0.41	0.03	0.18	
6. Physically threatened	0.10	0.50	0.04	0.24	0.02	0.15	0.16	0.62	0.13	0.59	0.08	0.38	
7. Physically attacked	0.02	0.18	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.15	0.07	0.32	0.02	0.17	0.03	0.25	
8. Had property Damaged	0.11	0.49	0.09	0.51	0.09	0.35	0.30	0.80	0.07	0.40	0.16	0.60	
9. How did the experience of these events affect you? [b]	2.19	1.35	2.30	1.35	2.78	1.52	2.68	1.51	2.33	1.36	2.66	1.40	EA < AA, L, ME
10. How often do you think this happens on campus each year? [d]	3.88	1.3	3.64	1.33	3.77	1.41	3.81	1.29	4.00	1.26	4.05	1.18	

[a] Based upon a 5-point scale ranging from never (0) to four or more times (4).
[b] Based upon a 5-point scale ranging from not at all (1) to a great deal (5).
[c] Significant differences resulting from Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD), $p < .001$.
[d] Based upon six categories [1 = zero, 2 = once, 3 = 2-5 times, 4 = 6-10 times, 5 = 11-15 times, 6 = 16 or more times]

Note: The number of respondents for each question varied from N = 987 for Q. 10 to N = 545 for Q. 7.

Comments	Categories of People All Students	
	Frequency	Percentage
Males	32	6.50%
European Americans	170	34.40%
African Americans	74	15%
Latinos	26	5.30%
Asian Americans	6	1.20%
Derogatory Word [a]	82	16.60%
Don't Know	55	11.10%
Anybody/Everybody	149	30.20%
Other	39	7.90%

Note*: Total number of comments said is 633; some respondents made more than one comment.

Note**: N = 494; Asian American (n = 71), African American (n = 45), Latino (n = 49), European American (n = 295), Multi-Ethnic (n = 34).

[a]Respondents did not name any specific race.